

SECTION II—REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for a thorough review, and respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

Claims 1-4, 10-15, 18-22, 25, 28-33, and 36-38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 10-15, 18-22, 25, 28-33, and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0204645 to Sharma et al. (“Sharma”). Applicants respectfully disagree. Independent claim 1, as amended herein, recites in pertinent part:

... accessing a **first logical port** defining a first configuration of a service endpoint interface, **the first logical port comprising an abstraction of an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface;**

selecting an item of configuration information in the accessed first logical port **to configure access to one or more operations of the service endpoint interface** via the first logical port ...

providing access to the one or more operations of the service endpoint interface based on the item of configuration information and the value for the selected item of configuration information defined.

General overview of the claimed limitations:

Applicants teach in the specification, “a first logical port ... **comprising an abstraction of an underlying port** associated with the service endpoint interface.” For example:

[00045] In an embodiment a logical port is automatically created for each existing port (e.g., port 750). For example, **logical port 720 may be created by default and may copy the features from the underlying port** (e.g., port 750) and binding (e.g., binding 754). Logical port 720 may then be copied to generate logical port 730.

* * *

[00086] Referring again to FIG. 19, a logical port file is created at process block 1940. In an embodiment, a logical port file describes a corresponding logical port(s) (e.g., logical port 720, shown in FIG. 7). **The described logical port may represent an abstraction of a service endpoint interface (and/or an underlying WSDL port)**. In addition, the described logical port may include configuration information for one or more Web service client protocols and/or endpoint configuration information.
...

Thus, Applicants teach in the specification, a “logical port ... comprising **an abstraction** of an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface. Such an abstraction is beneficial as it may allow the service endpoint interface to be configured via the logical port created, and may further allow multiple different configurations for the same service endpoint interface via multiple logical ports, each having their own configuration, despite an underlying configuration which ordinarily constrains the configurations to a single specified configuration. For example, Applicants teach in the specification:

[00041] In an embodiment, **logical ports 720 and 730 allow a user to define one or more configurations of SEI 740.** ... logical ports 720 and 730 **allow a computing device to set**, for example, an HTTP proxy, user authentication information, and/or protocol configuration. In an alternative embodiment, logical ports 720 and 730 **provide the computing device with more, fewer, and/or different configuration settings**.

Applicants further teach in the specification, “**providing access to the one or more operations** of the service endpoint interface,” as claimed. For example:

[00040] **Service endpoint interface 740 provides client application 710 with access to one or more of the operations in port 750.** In the illustrated embodiment, service endpoint interface 740 provides Web service method (or, for ease of reference, method) 742 to client application 710.

Sharma does not teach the claimed limitations:

The Office Action rejected claim 1 stating that Sharma discloses, “defining a first configuration of a service endpoint interface.” In support of its rejection, the Office Action makes reference to paragraph 118 of Sharma which states in pertinent part:

[0118] In addition to tasks performed by provider 136, client 510 may incorporate the use of deployer 137 to configure the service instance and proxies created by provider 136. For example, **deployer 137 may link a service reference to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding service.** This linking may be specific to the implementation of a container. For example, deployer 137 may link the logical service reference to the imported WSDL-based description of the service included in the WSDL document 550. Deployer 137 may also provide and configure information for the service instance and service endpoint proxies.

The Office Action then states that with reference to Sharma’s passage, “deployer 137 **may link a service reference to an actual representation and configuration** of a corresponding service,” Applicants should “*read as* accessing a logical port defining a service endpoint interface.”

However, Sharma makes no reference to a “logical port defining a service endpoint interface,” instead Sharma refers to a “deployer” that “**may link a service reference to an actual representation** and configuration of a corresponding service. The “**actual** representation” disclosed by Sharma corresponds to the “representation and configuration of a corresponding service” *in of itself*, thus Sharma’s use of the term, “**actual**” to describe the “representation and configuration.”

Conversely, Applicants recite in independent claim 1, a **first logical port** defining a first configuration of a service endpoint interface.” Applicants have amended claim 1 to further

clarify the nature of the “first **logical** port” as “**comprising an abstraction of an underlying port** associated with the service endpoint interface.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the “**actual** representation and configuration” which is “link[ed]” by Sharma does not anticipate the express limitation of Applicants’s claim which recites a “first **logical** port ... comprising an **abstraction** of an underlying port” Stated differently, “link[ing]” to an “**actual** representation and configuration of a corresponding service,” as disclosed by Sharma, is different than having a “**logical port** ... comprising an **abstraction** of an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface,” as Applicants recite in claim 1.

Sharma further clarifies his description of the “actual representation and configuration” by stating that

[0118] ... Deployer 137 may ensure that the configuration of a service and service proxy is **based on the protocol binding specified in the WSDL description of the service included in the imported WSDL document 550**. For example, the configuration of the stub instance may be that as previously described with respect to the client side API(s) 135.

Thus, in Sharma’s own description, the “configuration of a service ... is **based on the** protocol binding **specified** ... in the imported WSDL document,” and not based on a “local port ... comprising an **abstraction of an underlying port**.” Functionally speaking, the two concepts are very different. It would be illogical to suggest that Sharma can provide different configurations “based on the protocol binding **specified** ... included in the imported WSDL document.” Sharma does not contemplate or address the need for different configurations based upon a single “specified” configuration, and indeed, it would be impossible for Sharma to provide such a mechanism without more, such as the “**logical port** ... comprising an **abstraction** of an underlying port,” as taught and claimed by Applicants.

Because Sharma fails to disclose at least one limitation as Applicants recite in amended independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Sharma and is in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that independent claims 12, 19, 30, and 36, which recite similar limitations, as well as those claims which depend upon independent claims 1, 12, 19, 30, and 36, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 1-4, 10-15, 18-22, 25, 28-33, and 36-38.

Dependent claims 5-9, 16-17, 23-24, 26-27, 34-35, and 39-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected dependent claims 5-9, 16-17, 23-24, 26-27, 34-35, and 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of various combinations of Sharma in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0126136 to Omoigui (“Omoigui”), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0172555 to Beringer et al. (“Beringer”), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0199636 to Brown et al. (“Brown”). In particular, the Office Action rejected claims 5, 6, 16, 23, 24, 34, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Omoigui, claims 7, 17, 35, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Beringer, and claims 8, 9, 26, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Brown.

Omoigui, Beringer, and Brown, whether considered alone or in any combination, fail to cure the deficiencies of Sharma as each fails to disclose, “a first **logical** port defining a first configuration of a service endpoint interface, the **first logical port comprising an abstraction** of an underlying port associated with the service endpoint interface,” as Applicants recite in amended independent claim 1 presented herein. Dependent claims 5-9, 16-17, 23-24, 26-27, 34-

35, and 39-40, which rely directly or indirectly upon independent claims 1, 12, 19, 30, and 36, incorporate all the limitations of the independent claims upon which they depend, and thus, are patentable over the references and in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to dependent claims 5-9, 16-17, 23-24, 26-27, 34-35, and 39-40.

CONCLUSION

Given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked subject matter in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such subject matter may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (503) 439-8778.

Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

/Gregory D. Caldwell/

Date: April 2, 2009

Gregory D. Caldwell
Registration No. 39,926
Attorney for Applicants

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone: (503) 439-8778
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073